

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### **1. Objection to the drawings**

Formal drawings including reference numerals for each item shown are included with this response. It is submitted that the objections to the drawings have been overcome.

### **2. Claim objections**

In view of the amendment above to claim 7 it is submitted that the objection has been overcome.

### **3. Response to § 112 Rejections**

In view of the amendment above to claim 1 it is submitted that the objection has been overcome.

### **4. Response to § 102 Rejections**

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,285,381 B1 (hereinafter “Sawano”).

Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set out below, and ask the Examiner for reconsideration.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 1, as amended, relates to a method generating a computer generated animation to provide a visual accompaniment to music. Claim 1 includes the limitation of “altering an appearance of the texture-mapped video signal displayed on the surface of the selected object based on music events.” Support for this amendment can be found, *inter alia*, in Figure 4 of the drawings.

Sawano relates to creating images for electronic games. The “direction of movements of characters [are] operated by a player” using a controller 20 (see col. 5, lines 36 to 46). Sawano does not disclose or even suggest the limitation of **“altering an appearance of the texture-mapped video signal displayed on the surface of the selected object based on music events.”**

As Sawano does not disclose the limitation of claim 1 of **“altering an appearance of the texture-mapped video signal displayed on the surface of the selected object based on music events”**, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable. As claim 2 is depend upon claim 1, it is also allowable.

## 5. Response to § 103 Rejections

Claims 3 to 11 stand rejected under § 103(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,285,381 B1 (“Sawano”) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,696,892 B1 (“Redmann”).

Claims 3 to 11 are dependent upon claim 1 which, in view of the above remarks, is submitted to be allowable. According claims 3-11 are also allowable. It will be noted that Redmann does also not in any way disclose or even suggest the limitation of claim 1 of **“altering an appearance of the texture-mapped video signal displayed on the surface of the selected object based on music events. ”**

**Conclusion**

Having tendered the above remarks the Applicants respectfully submits that all rejections have been addressed and that the claims are now in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

It should furthermore be noted that the above amendments to the claims have not been made for reasons of patentability. The above amendments have been made with a view to modifying the form of the claims. For example, the word "steps" has been removed from the method claims so as to avoid interpretation of the relevant method claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 6.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact André Marais at (408) 947-8200 ext. 204.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 09/10/, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
André L. Marais  
Reg. No. 48,095

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 947-8200